

**REMARKS**

Claims 4 and 11 have been canceled. Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, and 16 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1, 3, 5-10, and 12-20 are pending.

Claim 16 has been amended in a manner believed to overcome the objection to the specification. Claims 1, 9, and 16 have been amended to overcome the claim objections.

The rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC 101 is respectfully traversed. Claim 9 recites “a computer” configured to perform the functions recited and therefore recites patentable subject matter.

Claims 1, 3, 5-10, and 12-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Raith in view of Hatta and Banes.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claims 1, 9, and 16, Raith describes sending a signal from a mobile phone network to a mobile phone to reset a “B key” on the mobile phone to a default or other value. Raith, col. 30, lines 38-54. The signal is sent and therefore the B key value is reset by the mobile network provider, not by a user of the mobile phone having a required level of privilege with respect to the phone such that the key is reset to a default value “without intervention of a provider with which the computer program is associated,” as recited in claims 1, 9, and 16. In addition, the signal taught by Raith is not a “flag” within the meaning of the claim because it is not an environment variable that is subsequently read to determine whether it has been set to a value indicating that the key should be reset to the default value, as recited in the claim. Finally, no particular level of privilege appears to be required to send the signal the resets the “B key” or start the process on the mobile phone that checks if it has been reset.

Hatta and Banes likewise do not describe a flag that is an “environment variable” stored on a computer with which the recited computer program is associated. Hatta describes flags that are set or reset to prohibit write or erase operations, depending on whether a user has supplied a password that matches a “predetermined password”. The flags described by Hatta are not used

**FILED VIA EFS**

to reset a password to a default value, as recited in claims 1, 9, and 16, but rather to ensure that only holders of the password(s) are allowed to perform certain operations. Hatta, col. 3, lines 13-60. Banes describes a password reset diskette that can be inserted physically into a computer to enable a password to be reset. A private key stored on a diskette or other physically insertable media, as taught by Banes, is not the same as an environment variable, as recited in the claims. Also, any person having possession of the diskette described by Banes would be able to reset the password, therefore no particular level of privilege is required to set the “flag” or start the process, as recited in the claims. As such, claims 1, 9, and 16 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 3 and 5-8 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above. Likewise, claims 10 and 12-15, which depend from claim 9, and claims 17-20, which depend from claim 16, are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 4, 2008

/Theodore A. Chen/  
Theodore A. Chen  
Registration No. 40,557  
V 925-600-5681  
F 925-600-5682

EMC Corporation